MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 April 1966

INDEX

	Page
ADMINISTRATION	
West Front Extension of Capitol, Engineering Report	1
SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS	
1. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission	
National Square - Development of Revised Design	1-2
2. District of Columbia Govt., Dept. of Buildings & Grounds	
a. National Zoological Park, Master Plan	2
b. West Plaza, Municipal Center - Additional Landscaping	2
3. Department of the Navy	
Master Plan for Washington Navy Yard, Preliminary Studies	2-3
4. Department of the Army	
a. Corps of Engineers	
U.S. Soldiers Home, Addn. to Domiciliary Building C	3
b. Special Warfare Memorial Committee	
Proposed Memorial at Ft. Bragg, N.C.	3
c. Office of Chief of Support Services	
Arlington National Cemetery, Design of Guard Shelters	3
5. National Park Service, National Capital Region	
Ponte Vecchio - Review of Proposed Design	4
6. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service	4
7. National Guard Association	
National Guard Memorial, Normandy, France - Reconsideration	4-5

8. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Union Station - Reroofing of Concourse 5

(2) S.L. 66-99, 718 15th St., N.W.-Floodlighting of Building 5

(3) S.L. 66-83, 618 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.-Store Bldg. 5

(4) S.L. 66-94, 415 12th St., N.W.-Office Building 5

(5) Building Applications 6

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown Medical Center-Further Design Studies 6

(2) Building Applications 6

LEGISLATION 6

INTERVIEWS

1. Department of the Navy

Master Plan for the Washington Navy Yard 6-7

2. D.C. Govt., Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Addition to Master Plan 7

3. National Guard Association

National Guard Memorial, Normandy, France - Reconsideration 7

4. D.C. Govt., Department of Licenses and Inspections

Georgetown University Medical Center - Further Design Studies 8

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 19 April 1966. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:30 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C. H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Legislative Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Mr. Astore
Steve Miller, a.m.
Recorder: Leone M. Vialpando, p.m.

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. The Commission decided to hold its next meeting on 17-18 May 1966.

2. The minutes of the February 1966 meeting were approved.

3. West Front Extension of Capitol, Engineering Report

The Commission discussed Dr. Meng Te Chang's analysis of an engineering report on the condition of the west front of the Capitol, prepared by the Thompson and Lichtner Company, Inc., for the architect of the Capitol. The members confirmed their previous position that the west front should be restored in its original design by Thornton and Latrobe. An extension of the front to provide additional office space was opposed. Additional office space should be obtained elsewhere.

The Chairman was authorized to express the Commission's views and to release them to the public when appropriate.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

1. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

National Square - Development of Revised Design

Reviewing a model of the revised design for a national square in the

Pennsylvania Avenue Plan, the Commission confirmed its general approval of the smaller space. Details will be submitted as they are developed. An interview with members of the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission scheduled for the following day was cancelled.

2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. National Zoological Park, Master Plan

The Secretary presented a scale model and drawings prepared by Umberto Innocenti - Richard K. Webel, landscape architects, for this project. He commented on the Monkey Island which was established in concept on the original Olmsted Plan of 1891. Pointing out the shelters for the hoofed animals, he called the members' attention to the fact that these were under construction although they had been disapproved by the Commission.

The Commission felt the landscape plans and the site and designs of buildings appeared as separate projects and should have been considered as one. An integrated whole can be achieved only by collaboration between landscape architect and architect.

Final action was withheld until a meeting with officials in charge of this project during the afternoon session.

b. West Plaza, Municipal Center - Additional Landscaping Elements

The Secretary presented drawings prepared by the staff of the Department of Buildings and Grounds for this project. The Commission approved the plans which included three dense yew hedges with azaleas along two hedges and sculpture near the center of the third. The members recommended that the plans be considered as temporary until the completion of plans for the Municipal Center and then made a part of the program for the entire area.

The Department of Buildings and Grounds was informed of the Commission's approval and recommendation. EXHIBIT A

3. Department of the Navy

Master Plan for Washington Navy Yard, Preliminary Studies

The Secretary presented a model and drawings of this project, prepared by Crane and Gorwic Associates, Inc., Planning and Urban Design Consultants in association with Robert L. Plavnick. He commented that the western section of the Navy Yard would be studied by the same consultants for General Services Administration. The Assistant Secretary stated that the historic structures - Latrobe gate, sail loft, etc., would be retained. Main features of the plan included a pedestrian spine from the main gate to the River and a central compound for historic buildings. The existing park would be

increased in size. New office buildings with several levels of underground parking were planned for the area where flooding occurs.

The Commission felt the combination of historic compound and administrative center was in the right direction but that the plan lacked coherence. Final action was withheld until a meeting with officials responsible for this project during the afternoon session.

4. Department of the Army

a. Corps of Engineers

U.S. Soldiers Home, Addition to Domiciliary Building C

The Secretary presented drawings prepared by the Corps of Engineers for this project. The Commission approved the plans for new north and south wings which included the use of dark granite and limestone for exterior material. The plans complimented the existing structure in design and materials.

The Commission's approval was reported to the Corps of Engineers with the recommendation that a new master plan be developed for the area. No interview with officials responsible for this project was necessary. EXHIBIT B

b. Special Warfare Memorial Committee

Proposed Memorial at Fort Bragg, N.C.

The Secretary presented photographs of the site and design for the memorial prepared by this Committee. He discussed the elaborate design which consisted of a nine foot bronze statue of a Special Forces Trooper (Green Beret component of the Army), a cliff, small waterfall, pool, rocky paths, roughstone walls, etc.)

The Commission considered the site and design inappropriate. The memorial committee was informed of the Commission's disapproval. EXHIBIT C

c. Office of the Chief of Support Services

Arlington National Cemetery, Design of Guard Shelters

The Secretary presented drawings prepared by the Corps of Engineers for this project. The Commission advised that prefab shelters not be used. The members suggested that the shelters be planned as portable structures and designed similarly to those for the White House.

The Commission's advice and suggestion were forwarded to the Corps of Engineers. EXHIBIT D

5. National Park Service, National Capital Region

Ponte Vecchio - Review of Proposed Design and Commission's Action

The Secretary presented photographs of model of the proposed design prepared by Chloethiel Woodward Smith and Associates, architects, for this project. The Commission confirmed its disapproval of the project as forwarded to the National Park Service by letter of 12 April 1966 (EXHIBIT E).

The members stressed that the bridge should be designed after plans for the Aquarium are completed and designed as a bridge and not a floating shopping center. The Waterfront area will provide necessary shopping facilities.

No other report to the National Park Service was necessary.

6. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

The Assistant Secretary presented brochures of the following artists for consideration in selecting one for the projects as listed. The Commission's action is noted.

a. Customs Court and FOB, New York, N.Y.

(1) Great seal at entrance - Sally S. Carr (approved), Joseph A. Kiselewski, and Rambusch.

(2) Great seal and group for Ceremonial Court - Frank Eliscu, Theodore Roszak (approved), and Frederick Shrady.

(3) Mosaic mural - Seymour Fogel (approved) and Lumen M. Winter.

(4) Sculpture in pool - Robert Cronback or George W. Hall which ever one the architect preferred.

b. John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, Mass.

Sculpture for courtyard - Herbert Feber (approved) and Beverly Pepper.

The Commission's approval of the above artists, as noted, was forwarded to General Services Administration. EXHIBIT F

7. National Guard Association

National Guard Memorial, Normandy, France - Reconsideration of Design

The Commission confirmed its disapproval of the design by Francois

Carpentier, architect, which indicated construction of the memorial on top of an old bunker. The members felt the bunker should be considered the memorial and the area appropriately landscaped.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of the National Guard Association during the afternoon session.

8. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Union Station - Reroofing of Concourse

The Secretary presented photographs of the Concourse roof. He explained the need to reroof and a proposal to cover the outer roof with an asphaltic compound. The Commission had no objection to the proposal provided the inside of the roof is painted white and large lights positioned between the roofs to reflect light through the translucent glass of the inner roof onto the Concourse.

(2) S.L. 66-99, 718 15th St., N.W. - Floodlighting of Building

The Commission had no objection to floodlighting the American Security and Trust Company building provided the intensity is controlled by rheostats. The members suggested that minimum lighting be used to produce a moonlight effect.

(3) S.L. 66-83, 618 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Store Building (added to order of business)

The Commission disapproved the proposed design prepared by Ted Englehardt, architect, for this one story and cellar commercial structure. The members advised the plans be submitted tothe Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue for review.

(4) S.L. 66-94, 415-12th St., N.W. - Office Building (added to order of business).

The Commission approved the plans prepared by Edmund W. Dreyfuss and Associates, architects, for this 12-story reinforced concrete building. The members requested that samples of exterior materials be submitted for review.

The Commission's actions on the above projects were reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(5) Building Applications

The Commission approved the action taken by the staff on Shipstead-Luce Applications listed on Appendix I. EXHIBIT G

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown Medical Center - Further Design Studies

The Secretary presented drawings prepared by Ellerbe and Company, and Mariani and Associates, architects/engineers for this project to be exposed concrete structure with inset brick and glass panels. The members discussed the project but withheld final action until a meeting with the architects and officials of the University during the afternoon session.

(2) Building Applications

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT H

IV. LEGISLATION

1. S. 2394-8/11/65-Mr.Monroney-89thC

To provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. (Review of Commission's action.)

The Secretary reported that an amendment to the above bill designated the U.S. Naval Observatory as the site. Having approved the bill, the Commission took no further action. EXHIBIT I

2. H.R. 13446-3/9/66-Mr.Bingam-89thC

To provide for the establishment and operation of a National Registry of Art for the purpose of maintaining and administering of records relating to the origin, transfer, and ownership of works of art. EXHIBIT J
The Commission favored the enactment of this legislation into law.

V. INTERVIEWS

Time permitted interviews during the afternoon session although they had been scheduled for the following day.

1. Department of the Navy

Master Plan for the Washington Navy Yard

Lt. Comdr. Green, Mr. Robert L. Plavnick, and other representatives

of the Department of the Navy and the Planning firm attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

The Commission commended the planners on the correct approach as indicated in the drawings. The members praised the retention of historic structures and the collaboration with General Services Administration in developing the entire area as a unit. They recommended that a study be made of a parking structure of three or four levels above ground which might form a wall and minimize damage from occasional floods. Bolder plans were recommended for the office buildings.

The Commission's approval of the concept of the plan was forwarded to the Department of the Navy with the recommendation that architects selected to complete the details be granted freedom to design and not be constricted by limited areas as designated in the plan. EXHIBIT K

2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

National Zoological Park, Addition to Master Plan

Mr. Mahoney representing officials of the Zoo attended the meeting during the discussion of this project. He requested that he be permitted to study the record of the hardy hoof stock shelters before answering the question concerning the construction of these without the Commission's approval of the plans. He commented that the plans for multiclimate building, then the administration building, would be the next projects submitted for the Commission's advice.

The Commission stressed its need to know the program for the Zoo. Without the program - present and proposed - the members cannot judge the Master plan. Relationships of vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns, site and design of structures to topography and the function of the building should be established and indicated in the plan. The Commission emphasized that collaboration must be established between landscape architect and architect, and the results reflected in the plan before approval can be given.

The Commission's disapproval of the master plan was reported to officials of the Zoo. EXHIBIT L

3. National Guard Association

National Guard Memorial, Normandy, France - Reconsideration of Design

Col. Deering of the National Guard Association attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

The Commission reiterated its opoosition to the design. The members stated

that the existing bunker should be considered the memorial. Restore the bunker and landscape the area would be appropriate. No additional construction on top of the bunker would be approved.

The Commission's disapproval of the plans was forwarded to the National Guard Association. EXHIBIT L.

4. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Georgetown University Medical Center - Further Design Studies

Father Collins of Georgetown University, Mr. Mariani, architect, and others attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

The Commission commended the architect on the progress made in overall massing and the attempt to express relationship of proposed and existing building. The members recommended that more studies be made and suggested several approaches to the problem - developing a structural system which wouldn't require 4 materials, a modern all-brick building, a concrete building, and other methods to the solution. The transcript of the meeting is EXHIBIT M.

The Commission's views were reported to officials of Georgetown University and the Department of Licenses and Inspections. EXHIBIT N.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

3 May 1966

Dear General Duke:

At its April 19, 1966 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts considered the design for proposed additional landscaping of the West Plaza at the Municipal Center.

The Commission has no objection to the proposal, but recommends that, if possible, this be a coordinated portion of the future development and completion of the Municipal Center plans.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General C. M. Duke
Engineer Commissioner for the
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT A

3 May 1966

Dear Mr. Kemper:

At its April 19, 1966 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts approved the design of an addition to Domiciliary Building C at the U.S. Soldiers Home. We assume that all materials will match those on the existing building.

In taking this action, however, the Commission would like to stress the need for a complete restudy of the existing Master Plan. This is essential prior to planning any new construction, as even a cursory study of the present plan reveals many weaknesses.

The Soldiers Home, as I'm sure you will agree, occupies one of the more important Federal sites in Washington. And as such its future growth is deserving of most careful study.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Joseph G. Kemper
District Engineer
Engineering Division
U.S.Army Engineer District, Baltimore
P.O. Box 1710
Baltimore, Md. 21203

EXHIBIT B

3 May 1966

Dear Captain Schenck:

At its meeting on April 19, 1966, the Commission of Fine Arts considered the design for a Special Forces Memorial at Ft. Bragg, N.C.

There is no objection to the concept of a memorial, but the design submitted is not approved.

The Commission finds the proposed design much too complicated. The statue feature and the excessive variety of landscaping are not appropriate to the formal setting of a military base, especially at Fort Bragg.

A more urbane solution with peripheral street trees, benches and walks, and simple planting would relate the memorial to its surroundings on all sides. A simplified base for the statue would likewise be more suitable.

The Commission will be glad to assist you with this project and will look forward to seeing further developments.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Captain Roger L. Schenck
Secretary
Special Warfare Memorial Committee, U.S.Army
John F. Kennedy Center for
Special Warfare (Airborne)
Fort Bragg, North Carolina 28307

EXHIBIT C

3 May 1966

Dear Mr. Metzler:

At its April 19, 1966 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs of guard shelters that are being considered for Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission approved the model which closely follows the ones recently installed on the White House grounds. Its design is simple and direct, yet it has a special character that makes it entirely suitable for use at Arlington.

The prefabricated unit with enamel steel panels and flat roof may be less expensive, but it is primarily designed as an industrial unit and looks it. It would be totally inappropriate in any cemetery.

The Commission would like to review the number and exact locations of the shelters before they are installed.

Please let us know at least a week in advance of our meetings, which are usually scheduled for the third Wednesday of each month.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. John C. Metzler
Superintendent
Arlington National Cemetery
Arlington, Virginia

EXHIBIT D

12 April 1966

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

Working under a contract with the National Park Service, Chloethiel Woodward Smith has submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts a preliminary design for a pedestrian bridge including commercial facilities to link Maine Avenue with East Potomac Park.

After careful consideration, the Commission members feel that the proposal is too big and bulky for this site. The model indicates provisions for restaurant and shopping facilities far greater than we think should be included in this over-the-water area. The bridge character of the structure would be almost entirely lost and though the design is handsome, it would look too much like a large commercial structure merely spanning a waterway.

The idea of a simple foot bridge, with perhaps some shops, at this location, is an attractive one to help unite the future aquarium with the Maine Avenue waterfront. Perhaps it should not be designed until we know what the aquarium is going to look like. Then Mrs. Smith's great talents might be better used in contributing to the total landscape of this potentially exciting area.

With best wishes,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director
National Park Service
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

3 May 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

At its meeting on April 19, 1966, the Commission of Fine Arts considered the selection of artists for the Customs Court and Federal Office Building in New York City and for the John F. Kennedy Federal Building in Boston, Mass. Of these artists presented, the following were selected:

1. Custom Court and Federal Office Building, New York City.

   a. Great Seal for Ceremonial, Theodore Roszak.

   b. Mosaic Mural, Seymour Fogel.

   c. Great Seal at Entrance, Sally Cam.

   d. Sculpture in Pool, no objection to either artist.

2. John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, Mass.

   Sculpture for Courtyard, Herbert Ferber.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
83	623 Penna. Ave., NW Store Bldg.	Constr. 1-story & cellar commercial bldg.

ACTION: Disap'd. Character of proposed design generally unsuitable for proposed location on Penna. Avenue, 4/19/66. This proj. should be forwarded to the Tempo. Comm. on Pa. Ave. for review.

84	8100 East Beach Dr., NW Mr & Mrs R. S. Marshall	Residence.

ACTION: Resubmit. Simplify west elevation with continuous board & batten strip, more uniform window treatment. Use same sill height for den & bedrm. #3. See drawings, 4/15/66.

85	400-506 N St., SW Harbour Square	Revision to roof structures.

ACTION: App'd., 4/15/66.

86	420 No. Capitol St., NW Hotel Continental	1 7½ sq-ft s-f sign to replace exist. Black ltrs. on white bckgd. Illuminated.

ACTION: Sign disap'd. Internally illuminated plastic sign disap'd. Back-lighted, open face, opaque letter, recom'd., 4/19/66.

87	8153 East Beach Dr., NW Wm. M. Bigelow	Placement of concrete slab for air-cong.

ACTION: App'd., provided unit is screened with evergreens similar to those next to front of house, 4/15/66.

88	420 No. Capitol St., NW Continental Hotel	1 canvas, circular door awning to conform with door opening. Blue & white. No fixed iron frames or posts.

ACTION: App'd. for solid color. Omit stripe, 4/15/66.

APPENDIX 1

EXHIBIT G

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
89	4220 Blagden Ave., NW N. W. Develop. Co.	Erect dwelling.

ACTION: Restudy with emphasis on simplifying & unifying all elements of design, incl. elimination of bulky stairs & entry foyer, the use of properly proportioned casement windows on all elevations, & the substitution of brick on gable ends, 4/15/66.

91	1003 D St., NW Souvenir World	1 s-f 24 sq-ft sign. 3/4" raised plywood ltrs. Blue.

ACTION: App'd., provided ltring. & sign panel conform in size & style to exist. Limit to blue & white only. Use 1 size ltr. only, 4/15/66.

92	301-1st St., NE Plaza Hotel	New brick front at stair-hall (D St. entr.)

ACTION: App'd., provided a central window element to match proposed is located in blank wall above stair hall entry. Submit drawing, 4/15/66.

93	2208 Cathedral Ave., NW Dorothy T. Daniel	Remove roof of front porch. Install new sash & hood at door. New door & steps at rear.

ACTION: App'd., provided living rm. window is made 4 lights wide within exist. opening, 4/15/66.

94	415-12th St., NW John Hancock Mutual Life Ins. Co.	Constr. 12-story reinforced conc. frame off. bldg. with brick & precast conc. encl. walls. Glazing to be as indicated on accompanying drawings.

ACTION: App'd. Request submission of materials for review, 4/19/66.

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
90	718-15th St., NW American Security Corp.	Install 6 500-watt, narrow beam, exterior lighting fixtures with appropriate shields centered behind each column to provide illum. of the column.

ACTION: App'd. for general lighting scheme, provided that rheostats are incorporated within the circuit in order to adjust the level of illumination which will be subj. to inspection on site, 4/19/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

MAR 2 3 1966

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
79	6990 Oregon Ave., NW Dr. G. H. Richmond	Revision to new dwelling.

ACTION: No obj. to bldg. Realign house to save 45" oak & as many other trees as possible, 3/10/66.

80	235-2nd St., NE Assembly Restaurant	Furnish & install 2 twenty-foot alum. flagpoles in ground area outside building.

ACTION: App'd., 3/10/66.

81	737-15th St., NW Woodward Bldg. Co.	Face exist. structure approx. 16' x 11' w/alum. & erect new showwindow w/leaded glass windows w/aluminum mouldings.

ACTION: Disap'd. Use of alum. & leaded glass in combination, particularly on the Woodward Bldg., is extremely inappropriate. Recom. that something simpler with materials more harmonious to bldg. be designed. Indicate exactly where entr. is to be & material colors in accurate scale drawing, MAR 2 3 1966

82	3636-16th St., NW Woodner Apts.	Swimming Pool.

ACTION: App'd., 3/15/66, Strongly recom. relocation of exist. weeping birch trees as screening.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

MAR 17 1966

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
195	3204 M St., NW Rive Gauche, Inc.	1 s-f sign. 30X46". Black ltrs. on white plastic bckgd.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of lettering unsuitable. Recom. classical, vertical style ltr., 3/1/66.

212 — 1659-61 35th St., NW; B & G Devel. Corp. — Remodel-revision to OG 66-174.

ACTION: Request add'l. inf. Subm. drawing or picture indicating size of actual coach lamps. Restudy 35th St. showwindow. Recom. that scalloped head on showwindow be eliminated, & simple rectangular panels be used at base of window. Mullions on showwindow shall not exceed 3/4" in width. Proportions of all glass panes to be the same & height is to exceed width. Indicate size of shutters; they must be of proper size to cover windows when shut. Make corrections on original tracings & resubmit new prints for review, 3/4/66.

213 — 2705 P St., NW; Mrs L. L. Coleman — Erect 3rd fl. rear to exist. dwell.

ACTION: Resubm. showing 3rd fl. addn. with windows identical to those on lower flrs. This applies to size, type, & material, 3/3/66.

214 — 3038 Cambridge Pl., NW; Calvin Cafritz — Constr. 7' high wood fence at rear. Entirely on owner's property.

ACTION:: Recom'd. for design as shown on revised set of drawings dated 3/1/66, 3/4/66.

215 — 1315-31st St., NW; Mr & Mrs H. J. Coolidge — Addns. & alterations. Revisions in accordance with OG 66-205.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided new brick match exist. as closely as possible, 3/3/66.

216 — 2620 Dumbarton Ave., NW; Mrs Sarita W. Peet — Build brick chimney on rear of bldg.

ACTION: No obj. to chimney, but recom. that 2' width be reduced if possible, 3/3/66.

EXHIBIT H

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
217	2916 N St., NW Mrs N. Perkins	Replace wood stoop & steps with brick & replace old rail with new finish.

ACTION: Resubm. showing brick work details. This should incl. exact design of treads & risers. Recom. treads have rowlock similar to present bottom step. Correct drawings to indicate wood railings, their rehabilitation & reuse, 3/3/66.

218	2920 N St., NW Mrs Barbara Baldwin	Replace wood stoop & steps with brick & refinish old rail.

ACTION: Resubm. showing brick work details. (Action same as action on OG 66-217).

219	1560 Wisc. Ave., NW Harvey L. Jones	1 s-f, 12 sq-ft sign. "For Lease" type sign.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided lettering is black, & that sign is 15' back from sidewalk, 3/3/66.

220	1214-30th St., NW Ira Glackens	Replace light fixture at front entr. of house.

ACTION: Resubm. showing exact size of proposed lamp, 3/3/66.

221	2524 Q St., NW R. A. Eldridge	Resubm. of OG 66-182 for new dwelling. Also 6' split cedar fence.

ACTION: App'd. in concept. Recom. that 1st fl. front windows be made the same width as those above. 3/6 light sash may permit this with proper proportions. Railing at rear of lot should be similarto that of back stoop, 3/3/66.

222	3222 M St., NW D.C. Transit System Bldg.	Replace exist. windows with driveway entr. door.

ACTION: Recom'd., 3/1/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

MAR 3 0 1966

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
209	1075 Thos. Jeff. St., NW A. L. Wheeler	Motel.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided sun deck fence matches railing on lower deck rather than chain link. Also, provided that the penthouse & parapet wall are modified according to attached sketches, 3/3/66.

211	1403 Wisc. Ave., NW Peoples Drug Stores	Change letters "E" & "L" for sign.

ACTION: No obj. to sign as shown, but consider black painted ltrs. on the bldg. surface as being much more appropriate & attractive, 3/21/66.

223	3107 M St., NW Fred Astaire Studio	1 s-f, 22.6 sq-ft metal sign. Black ltrs. on white bckgd. Back-lighted ltrs. with white neon tubing.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of ltr. unsuitable, too heavy & too stylized. Recom. character similar to other sign on bldg. Also reduce thickness of transformer box, MAR 3 0 1966

224	3020 K St., NW Potomac Sand & Gravel Co.	Constr. 1-story addn. - toilet & locker rm.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that leader on south elevation is located 1' from corner, 3/22/66.

225	1271 Wisc. Ave., NW M. A. Fisher (Commercial)	New entry Wisc. Ave. with door into each shop & window. N St. remove door & transom & brick up base & build new single large window. Brick up small openings.

ACTION: Recom'd., 3/22/66.

226	1225 Wisc. Ave., NW Tivoli Restaurant	1 s-f 24 sq-ft sign. Marine plywood sign. Black & gold.

ACTION: Resubmit. No obj. to concept, but recom. that ltrs. do not have square serifs. Also indicate exact location on bldg., 3/22/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued) MAR 30 1966

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
228	1689-34th St., NW Wenzella Ripley	Enlarge exist. garage door opening in masonry wall & install new door.
ACTION:	No obj., 3/22/66.	
229	3410 Volta Pl., NW Dora R. Lowenstein	Move entr. frame forward, using same design, add blinds.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 3/22/66.	
230	1047-31st St., NW Georgetown Car Wash	2 d-f signs, 24 sq-ft. Illuminated.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Type of sign generally inappropriate for Georgetown area. Recom. sign mounted over doorway. See action on OG 66-175, MAR 30 1966	
231	1659-35th St., NW B & G Develop. Corp.	Replace sash & doors.
ACTION:	Recom'd., except for items noted on drawing. Resubmit corrections to pertinent material, 3/15/66.	
232	1214-30th St., NW Ira Glackens	Install lights.
ACTION:	No obj., 3/22/66.	
233	1321-34th St., NW J. Leo Kolb	Install 1 light on side of entr. doorway.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 3/22/66.	

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
234	3104 P St., NW Donald A. Coster	Replace rotted wood frames.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 3/22/66.	
235	2524 Q St., NW R. A. Eldridge	Corrections per CFA recommendations on OG 66-221
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided 1st fl. sash match 3rd fl. sash. Request sample of brick, 3/22/66.	
239	1628-32nd St., NW Mr & Mrs N. A. Gibbs	Add 3rd story over exist. structure with new mansard roof, dormers & roof terrace (re submittal cuts due to budget).
ACTION:	Recom'd., 3/22/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 4/19-20/66

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
227	3800 Reservoir Rd., NW Georgetown U.	New facilities for medical center incl. dental clinics, basic science bldg., library, hospital addn.

ACTION: Resubm. Inadequate inf. on materials & details. Indicate all materials, copings, trim, colors & type of sash material & color. Show trim & detail relationships to exist. structures. The $\frac{1}{4}$"-scale details are neither drawn or labeled properly to indicate exact materials, dimensions or definite obtainable products. Surface skin is not indicated the same in section & elevation?, 4/5/66.

236	3125 M St., NW Arpad Antiques, Inc.	1 s-f sign, 15 sq-ft. Metal ltrs. with baked flat white finish.

ACTION: Recom'd., 4/1/66.

237	3140 "O" St., NW Ralph Stephan	Replace front wood porch & steps with brick steps & w.i. rails.

ACTION: No obj. to concept, but request additional inf. & illustration on iron work. All new brickwork must match exist., 4/1/66.

238	3138 "O" St., NW Ralph Stephan	Remove wood porch & steps at front of house & replace with brick steps & w.i. rails; install iron balc. & encl. elec. mtrs.

ACTION: No obj. to concept, but request add'l. inf. & illustration on iron work. All new brickwork must match exist., 4/1/66.

240	1517-35th St., NW Mr & Mrs A. G. Mumma, Jr.	2-story brick addn. of dining rm. master bedrm. & bath.

ACTION: Recom'd., 4/1/66.

241	1427-27th St., NW Hugh N. Jacobsen	Replace exist. panelled door with new flush door.

ACTION: No obj., 4/1/66.

APPENDIX 2

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
242	3224-26 Prospect Ave., NW Doggett Parking Co.	Build ret. wall of brick approx. 3' x 70' along front of above address. (in place).

ACTION: No obj. to ret. wall. Provide screening above retain. wall with brick or stockade fence 4' above grade & 1' behind ret. wall of park. lot. Recom. planting also. See attached drawing. Subm. revised design for new fence, 4/1/66.

243	3122 M St., NW Georgetown Haberdashers	White cedar stockade fence on metal posts.

ACTION: No obj., provided fence supports are located on inside of yard, 4/1/66.

244	Rear 3321 N St., NW F. C. de Wolf	Constr. chimney.

ACTION: No obj., provided chimney is rectangular in plan, metal & painted to match roof, 4/1/66.

245	1210-30th St., NW Millicent Childs Inv. Corp.	Remove exist. tin roof, tin dormer roof & sides & replace with slate. Exchange positions of center window & entr.-physically evident that the entr. was originally at center. Remove downspout & gutter.

ACTION: Recom'd., 4/15/66.

246	3025 Orchard Le., NW Dr & Mrs Peter S. Bing	Extend front bedrm. over exist. garage. Bow windows on front & east side.

ACTION: Recom'd., 4/15/66.

247	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	12-unit apt. bldg.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Character & massing of bldg. are not appropriate to location in Georgetown. Recom. complete restudy of plans & elevations, 4/19/66.

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
248	3229 R St., NW Ernest Luskey	Woven chestnut sapling fence, 6½' high.
ACTION: Recom'd., 4/15/66.		
249	2901 M St., NW Colonial Parking, Inc.	Non-illuminated metal sign to be erected on exist. pole back of bldg. line.
ACTION: Non-illuminated sign recom'd., provided scroll brackets are eliminated & sign is hung from exist. cross bar. Subm. drawing showing revisions plus a section showing thickness & profile of sign, 4/15/66.		
251	2705 P St., NW Mrs Laurie L. Colemen	Erect addn. to exist. bldg. at 3rd fl. in rear.
ACTION: Recom'd., 4/15/66.		
252	1611 Wisc. Ave.,NW Randolph W. Reed, Jr.	Attendant's shed, walls & lights w/posts. Sign to be subm'd. later.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Resubm. Eliminate 2 lamps--one in the center of each section of wall. Restudy grading & wall relationship at so. end on Wisc. Ave. so that lower portions of parked autos. are less visible from Ave. & sidewalk. Recom. that add'l. screening be provided in the form of 3'-high sapling fence behind & above brick wall on so. section & on no. section from attendant's house to property line. Suggest fence be cut smooth on top & topped with redwood cap strip. Continue screening around corner to gas station bldg. to prevent objectionable appearance from sts. Suggest several flowering trees be planted behind screen wall. Submit brick sample & all material colors, 4/19/66.		
253	1400-34th St., NW Dr & Mrs Paul S. Weisberg	Replace exist. roof deck & rail. with new constr.
ACTION: Recom'd., 4/15/66.		

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
254	2904 P St., NW Nicholas Craw	Remodel doorway & install coach lights.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest if doorway is remodelled a doorway more in keeping with the early period of the house be selected. Exist. light far more appropriate than proposed coach lamps, 4/19/66.

255	1225 Wisc. Ave., NW Tivoli Opera	1 s-f, 24 sq-ft sign. Black bckgd., gold ltrs. Flat against under protrusion of metal cornice.

ACTION: No obj. to general design of sign. Request drawing showing exact relation of sign to bldg., 4/15/66.

256	1605 Caton Pl., NW Walter Joyce	Addn. of bay window at end of living rm.

ACTION: Recom'd. subj. to Zoning approval, 4/15/66.

250	3242 M St., NW Edmond J. O'Donnell	Install sign.

ACTION: Resubmit accurate scale drawing of sign in relation to bldg. Question 2' height. Recom. that sign have black ltrs. on white bckgd., 4/15/66.

258	3800 Reservoir Rd., NW Georgetown U.	Addns. to Medical center.

ACTION: Not recom'd. See attached ltr. dtd. 5/3/66 to Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses & Permits, 5/3/66.

3 May 1966

Dear Mr. Green:

At its April 19th meeting, the Commission of Fine Arts considered further design studies for the Georgetown University Medical Center. The Commission recommends additional study of the exterior treatment of the proposed structures.

There is no objection to tying together various buildings with a uniform type and scale of expressed structure; in fact, the Commission feels this is essential to the completed design. However, it is suggested that this be restudied without the present brick panel in-fill and with a smaller module. We discussed this in considerable detail with the architects and representatives of the University.

The Commission meets again on May 18th, and will be glad to review any new studies at that time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of
Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

Eighty-ninth Congress of the United States of America

AT THE SECOND SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Monday, the tenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six

An Act

Authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The Administrator is further authorized to use as a site for such residence Federal land and property comprising approximately ten acres at the United States Naval Observatory, the specific area and boundaries thereof to be determined jointly by the General Services Administration and the Department of the Navy: *Provided*, That any roads and improvements thereon for which there is a continued need may be relocated and reconstructed.

SEC. 3. The Administrator is further authorized to provide for the care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of the official residence and grounds, including heating, lighting, and air conditioning, which services shall be provided at the expense of the United States.

SEC. 4. The Administrator of General Services is further authorized to accept cash gifts, furniture, and furnishings and other types of gifts on behalf of the United States for use in constructing and furnishing the official residence but without further conditions on use, all such articles thus given to become the property of the United States.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, the sum of $750,000 for planning, design, construction, and costs incidental thereto, including the cost of initial furnishings.

SEC. 6. There is further authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, annually, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 3.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Vice President of the United States and
President of the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

March 31, 1966

Dear Mr. Rommel:

I am writing in reply to your request for the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on S. 2394, an enrolled bill "Authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States."

The Commission of Fine Arts favors the establishment of an official residence for the Vice President and has recommended approval of the original version of S. 2394. The enrolled bill includes an amendment which designates a specific location on the site of the Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., an aspect of the legislation which the Commission has not yet considered. We therefore have no comment on a specific site at this time.

We expect that the design and other related aspects of the project will be submitted for the Commission's review through the normal channels by the General Services Administration.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. W. H. Rommel
Acting Ass't Director for
Legislative Reference
Bureau of the Budget
Washington, D. C. 20003

EXHIBIT 1[2]

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13446

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 9, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

A BILL

To provide for the establishment and operation of a National Registry of Art for the purpose of maintaining and administering records relating to the origin, transfer, and ownership of works of art.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of sections 1 through 7 of this Act—

(a) The term "Board" means the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

(b) The term "Registry" means the National Registry of Art established by sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

(c) The term "Commission" means the National Regis-

EXHIBIT 4

try of Art Commission as provided for in section 3 of this Act.

(d) The term "work of art" shall be broadly construed and shall include such classifications of visual arts as may from time to time be prescribed by rules and regulations authorized by sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

(e) The term "certificate of authenticity" means a statement signed by the artist of the creation of a work of art and of the ownership thereof. Certificates of authenticity shall be in such form as may from time to time be prescribed by rules and regulations authorized by sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

(f) The term "certificate of transfer" means a record of transfer of a work of art in such form as may from time to time be prescribed by rules and regulations authorized by sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

(g) The term "person" includes an individual, a fiduciary, a partnership, a joint venture, a corporation, a governmental body or unit, and any other entity which may own or hold personal property.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL REGISTRY OF ART; FUNCTIONS.—There is established in the Smithsonian Institution a bureau which shall be known as the National Registry of Art. The Registry shall function as a repository for the custody, indexing, and maintaining of certificates of

authenticity, certificates of transfer, characteristic signatures of artists, and such other collateral records as it may from time to time accept for filing, for the purpose of keeping and administering a permanent record of the origin, transfer, and ownership of works of art.

SEC. 3. CREATION OF NATIONAL REGISTRY OF ART COMMISSION; MEMBERS; FUNCTIONS; POWERS.—There is created the National Registry of Art Commission. The Board may from time to time prescribe the membership of the Commission and their manner of appointment and tenure. The members of the Commission shall serve as such members without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission. The Board may delegate to the Commission any function of the Registry or any function of the Board with respect to the Registry. The Board may make rules and regulations for the conduct of the affairs of the Commission and the operation of the Registry, and to the extent and under such limitations as the Board deems advisable, the Board may delegate to the Commission the power to make such rules and regulations to become effective when approved by the Board.

SEC. 4. DIRECTOR; APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION; OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—(a) The Board shall

appoint and fix the compensation and duties of the Director of the Registry, and his appointment and salary shall not be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation, and maintenance of the Registry.

(b) The Board may delegate to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, as well as to the Commission, any of its functions pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 5. OPERATION OF REGISTRY.—(a) The operation of the Registry shall be supervised by the Director of the Registry.

(b) Any person who has a direct or indirect interest in a work of art may file a certificate of authenticity or a certificate of transfer in the Registry, in accordance with the rules and regulations authorized by sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

(c) When required by the director of the Registry, any person who has previously filed a certificate, and wishes to continue the registration, shall file a certificate of renewal in the Registry, in accordance with the rules and regulations authorized by sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

(d) The director of the Registry may, in his discretion, procure and accept for filing characteristic signatures in various media of artists selected by him and such other col-

lateral documents which he considers will advance the objectives and functions of the Registry.

(e) The director of the Registry may, in his discretion, issue code numbers to any person who does not desire to disclose to the public his interest in a work of art. Except as to the identity of the holders of such code numbers, the files and records of the Registry shall be public documents and shall be open to inspection in accordance with rules and regulations authorized by sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

(f) The director of the Registry may issue photostatic and certified copies of any documents filed in the Registry, and may publish reports relating to such documents, and may transmit matters relating to such documents to public agencies and authorities. Neither the director nor any person on behalf of the Registry shall issue any opinion as to the origin, authenticity, ownership, or value of any work of art or as to the validity or genuineness of any certificate, characteristic signature or collateral record filed in the Registry.

(g) The principal office of the Registry and of the director shall be located in the city, county, and State of New York. Microfilm or other duplications of the records of the Registry may be filed in such other institutions as may be designated by the Board.

(h) The director of the Registry shall from time to

time establish fees for the filing of certificates of authenticity, certificates of transfer, and any signatures and collateral records, and charges for issuing photostats and certifications thereof.

(i) The Board may adopt an official seal for the Registry which shall be judicially noticed.

(j) The Smithsonian Institution shall include in its annual report of its operations to Congress a statement of the operations of the Registry.

SEC. 6. UNLAWFUL ACTS; PENALTIES.—(a) It shall be unlawful for any person in the sale, transfer, or other disposition of a work of art to use or publish any information obtained from or issued by the Registry in a manner which would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser, transferee, or other recipient of such work of art.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this title, or the rules or regulations promulgated under authority thereof, or any person who willfully, in a certificate of authenticity, a certificate of transfer, a signature, or any collateral record filed in the Registry, makes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of sections 1 through 7 of this Act.

3 May 1966

Dear Captain Bartlett:

At its April 19, 1966 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts considered Preliminary Studies of a Master Plan for the Washington Navy Yard. The Commission approves the concept of preserving the historic core of the Navy Yard and flanking it with administrative structures. The Commission also favors the use of open space in the historic compound and along the water front. We support the use of multi-level parking structures at the Navy Yard so that the historic character can be retained and the desired office density can be achieved.

Further study should be given to the massing, height and arrangement of the proposed new office and parking structures. The possibility of screening the expressway and bridge interchange to the east with parking structures should be investigated. Careful attention should also be given to coordinating the Navy's Master Plan with those adjacent to General Services Administration and the District of Columbia, particularly with respect to circulation and the river front.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Captain J. V. Bartlett
Director, Chesapeake Division
Bureau of Yards and Docks
Building 57
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20390

EXHIBIT K

3 May 1966

Dear General Cantwell:

At its April 19 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts reconsidered the design for a National Guard Memorial in Normandy, France. The Commission reaffirmed its original disapproval of this design.

Our recommendation is that no construction be placed on top of the existing bunker. Memorialization of the bunker by a simple marker and landscaping should be considered. The possibility of restoring the bunker to its original form should also be studied.

The Commission will be glad to review additional studies at any time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Major General James F. Cantwell
President
National Guard Association of the
United States
1 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

EXHIBIT L

they were donating this land, this site to us.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Quite a gift.

Thank you for coming.

COL DEERIN: Thank you. Sorry I couldn't do better.

- - -

(Georgetown Medical Center)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm surprised to see you here, Father Collins, because in a sense these are minor compared to your usual presentation.

FATHER COLLINS: It's always a pleasure to come here, Mr. Walton.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, we've been looking at this this morning, and it seems to us that there's been a start, an attempt to get a unified -- sort of attempt at new architecture, new buildings to get a design quality to it that would be a guide for all the buildings so there would be some unity and the idea of the retaining walls and things look pretty interesting, but then we come to the question of what is this architecture that keeps repeating and in this drawing (indicating) looks quite neat? And this I think represents the type of architecture that is talked about and at first glance, you know, it's a very neat floor and column arrangement and you'd guess that this is big, large windows (indicating) but I guess it isn't -- perhaps you don't want

that much light in the rooms, so this is brick, I understand, masonry, so really in a sense it's kind of fake because you get a feeling this is a void but it isn't. These (indicating) are the voids and this is retained, and made to look like a void by changing color, so you might say it's kind of superficial.

Then also we have a feeling this is an attempt at architecture to please the Fine Arts Commission, not the campus, the plan of the hospital. As I understand it -- I haven't been to the hospital -- but I understand it is essentially all red brick.

FATHER COLLINS: Multicolor brick.

MR. CUDE: There are quite a few different shades of brick out there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But in the red family, not yellow or white.

FATHER COLLINS: Blue. There are a lot of blues. War-time brick.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But no yellow or buff or anything like that.

FATHER COLLINS: Right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So we've been wondering this, we don't want any part of this which I would say was submitted for what you think the architects of the Fine Arts Commission would lik not what is right for this campus; and we do respect the

attempt to express general massing, which seems good -- the bricks and things -- the relationships and even making this a special thing (indicating). This could be different from the others, and I think all that is fine, but what we are now talking about is the general character of the basic new work that follows a pattern for the rest of the work that is similar to that and has some relation in color and this (indicating) isn't it because this is a very strong concrete structure which would be essentially white or gray or something, and we wondered if an attempt shouldn't be made -- and this is very hard and there are a good many young architects trying to do it -- do an all-brick building that is really modern, not just holes poked in a brick wall; and somehow get some character and get the color.

We're not saying how. But we think it should be done where you put a net frame and then stuff in brick, because you don't want glass -- now what we're talking about is very hard to do.

MR. CUDE: It certainly is. We tried it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We're puttering around on a job ourselves and it's hard, but I think if it could be solved, I think it would give greater unity to existing buildings as well as the new, and also give appropriateness for the scale and amount of light you need.

I think we're trying to say there is progress in the overall massing, and we think perhaps this (indicating) is out of proportion. This could be concrete or something, light; this is a focal thing. We think this (indicating) has to recall that color and can't be superficial matter of putting masonry in to look like a void.

MR. CUDE: Well, we really want to express that as a void.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Also, forgetting this, if you did it in all glass, I have a feeling it would not be quite appropriate unless you're going to have so much of it that the old stuff was a kind of small portion, and there does happen to be now quite a bit of interest in attempting to do brick buildings without just using bearing walls, structure not just veneer, with less glass than has been used, and try to give special character to it. It may involve some juggling, you know, planes and surfaces and maybe the windows are recessed or something. As I say, what we're talking about is not easy.

MR. CUDE: Well, I know it's not easy. I appreciate your comment about the sort of building you'd like to see.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Now what I'd like to see. Excuse me. This is what you think I'd like to see. What we think is suitable for this site. That's a hard thing.

MR. CUDE: I don't quite understand your objection to treating the frame this way.

MR. WARNECKE: It looks like an office building frame or factory.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You're trying to make it look like a building with all glass, and then you put in a solid. That's what's wrong. That's just decoration.

MR. CUDE: Well the reason we did this in red is because we have a problem here with all of these different buildings, a number of different-sized units. We have hospital rooms, classrooms, auditoriums, libraries, laboratory facilities, any number of different sizes and elements. Now we thought we had to find something to give some unit to the project.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What's down at the bottom here which is darker brown?

MR. CUDE: That's glass.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We were wondering what would happen if this were a bare brick structure, with rhythm and this set-back.

MR. CUDE: You can do that but you get a lot of strips, very strong vertical accents on a horizontal campus and you get a different look over here (indicating).

We have very large units here (indicating) and very small ones there (indicating).

MR. KELLY: Is that the fenestration you want for hospital rooms?

MR. CUDE: Yes. There's a partition in the middle, one window in each room.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You have a window in the corner here and then a partition, so it's two small rooms.

MR. WARNECKE: And you also want your windows there for the whole thing, whole complex?

MR. CUDE: No, that's one of the reasons we chose a grid which can accept the fenestration plans.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Here it is worse (indicating) because then you have a grid and you fill in the brick.

MR. CHANDLER: We're trying to express the frame itself, and that's why these things are dark and it's arranged to make a rectangle.

MR. WARNECKE: I don't think the scale of the frame is compatible with the existing buildings. You could do something just as strong and contemporary working a little harder and have it tie in with the old buildings.

MR. CUDE: What do you feel about the scale?

MR. WARNECKE: If I squint my eyes I can see this

as a very powerful thing, a multistory office building, or it could be a great factory.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This whole facade up to here (indicating) is new, so from this side all this would be new, except from the distance you see that (indicating). Now what about this side?

MR. CUDE: That's here (indicating). What you see from that side is all the old stuff. You see existing medical school, existing hospital, existing dormitory here. You see this wing of the hospital and you see this building which is far back, and you see this (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: In a way this is all a new facade, so you don't have to muck it up.

MR. WARNECKE: No but it's still a unit from within.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well thatscale has a scale of floors and columns. You can't make little pierced windows like this.

FATHER COLLINS: Mr. Bunshaft --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Go ahead, Father Collins.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They may have a point is what I'm trying to say. We could be wrong, too.

FATHER COLLINS: Mr. Mariani is on his way here. I went over this with Ted Mariani. As I see it there are two problems. One is the problem from Reservoir Road where we have an existing hospital building, and around the corner

in an insert is a building that's a dormitory. This is the School of Nursing and behind that is another building that is a dormitory (indicating on sketch). Now as I understood Ted, the former thoughts were that this should be something which should have its own architectural integrity, so given the tremendous problem of design in slipping back and forth, the hospital itself, if you drive by it, you have a protrusion here with the fact that architecturally it's not from the brick or design of the hospital, it's the various protrusions that come out at different levels here.

Now trying to pick this as a building that will be considerably back from the road, the idea was to try to pick up some of the common elements that are in the hospital and emphasis on what is here. Now in trying to do th as I understand it, the question of this (indicating on desig the cement, the slab was the most economical way for him to have it structured. Now I may be wrong but that I took as a suppositive working on all our buildings against an extremely tight budget, so this then was should we cover this with brick or should we take the module, and this worked rather neatly of having an expanding element here and using then a panel of brick where the windows on the outside of it being the elements, that this can slide back and forth and still give yo a modular continuity, and the brick panel here with glass in

the side was because the thought was that the reflection of the light would naturally make this appear somewhat darker. This I have no expertise on, but the idea behind it of having expansibility and still giving the integrity to this building with lines emphasizing what is in here and picking up the architectural masses by moving back and forth in here, I personally thought was a good idea, and Ted could much more fluently express what he was trying to do.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That part I doubt; you're doing pretty well.

FATHER COLLINS: That was the idea behind this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes. Now I think myself it could be when you start to realize all the new buildings, they really could be new buildings and you could say the devil with the rest, and really do new buildings. I think you could do that.

FATHER COLLINS: I like that idea myself. A real architectural element of an old building, to try to fool with it would wreck it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you could make this all new and it would hold together in a funny way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The campus view is the new view, and the stree view remains red with an inset way back, and

you never see it from the angle this rendering gives you; you couldn't possibly.

MR. CUDE: You couldn't possibly because you have a berm there.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This doesn't exist.

MR. CUDE: No, but it's an effective way to study it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But visually you never see it.

MR. CUDE: Visually from Reservoir Road you have pretty much the vista you have today. You have a berm there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Now let's say you are going to forget about the old and do a new job. Instead of doing this sort of industrial thing, what would happen if you went to a 10-foot module and really got some -- I'm talking about structural.

MR. CUDE: We can't keep that module throughout the project. We tried that, we'd love to do it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I think you can change the scale. You can go then to 12 or 14 feet. I don't think it has to be identical, but there are several structural ways of building a building. This can be almost wall bearing, concrete, columns every 10 or columns every 5 feet. I think you fellows are right so far, but not in the detail here. This hasn't got the richness you ought to have. You can have

a structural system that transfers and has a little juice to it. If we were doing this --I'm not saying you should do it -- I'm just showing that -- throwing out ideas, so you can go back and try some more -- if you went to a smaller pattern, you could put a sill in here. You'd have structure, glass and the sill and wouldn't have to do this thing (indicating) which bothers us. I'm not talking about all glass. I'm talking about getting a lot of concrete in here.

MR. WARNECKE: If they don't go in the direction of some sort of frame -- and I agree with you.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It doesn't have to be 21 feet; the outside wall could be every five feet.

MR. WARNECKE: You're thinking of an all concrete thing in glass now, aren't you?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't see any need for little touches of red in this.

MR. CHANDLER: Our project is much bigger and will be much stronger than what is there, and I think it's a very small -- what we're trying to do is -- you keep relating the thing about matching brick or putting brick to relate to another campus. What we are trying to do is exactly the reverse.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I agree. I wouldn't have any brick in here at all.

MR. CHANDLER: Well this is brick of a color that would be different.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I wouldn't use masonry any place unless it were doing something. This is just filling in a wall, kind of a fake thing. Don't these windows look out on quite a view?

MR. CUDE: Toward the main campus.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you'd get almost the same amount of glass by having a sill and more structure.

MR. CUDE: When you say a sill, are you talking about a precast concrete sill?

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, I'm talking about if you had more columns and set this glass back -- I'm not setting this back, I'm setting this out; and then put in a 30-inch sill covered with glass just like the upper one. You've got this big unit here.

I'm really talking to your client. This is a sill here (indicating), and this is solid, see, so the only window you've got that you look through is this little hole here (indicating). It ought to be looking out on that nice view. I'm just suggesting one system where you get more structure in here. This is like a wall, you know; you've got columns wherever you want and split them here, and get a piece of glass that big (indicating).

MR. CHANDLER: There's also a bathroom in some of the

MR. CUDE: This is an intensive care building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You mean to tell me in a 10-foot room you've got a bathroom on the outside wall?

MR. CUDE: No.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You're really faking like mad here, fellows. This is the window you have here (indicating), and then you have three materials.

FATHER COLLINS: What's the material underneath the window?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Glass -- to make it look like glass. I'm suggesting, Father, you could make it smaller scale by having more structure here and then having a window that big.

MR. CUDE: Do you think a 10-foot span is economical in concrete?

MR. BUNSHAFT: On the outside wall it becomes very cheap.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: It hasn't anything to do with cost. In fact, the cost is cheaper if it's the surface on the outside.

MR. WARNECKE: I think you are trying to get approval on something here that relates to this whole thing which is very important to Georgetown.

MR. CUDE: Right.

MR. WARNECKE: He's got one window solution which we can't see, and I think it would be very helpful if you authorize the architects to study this thing in detail all the way through here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They are.

MR. WARNECKE: All we have is this one thing. We pointed out today there are two or three different possible solutions, and we think you ought to study it -- express the rooms, modules, windows and not justone solution for this whole thing.

MR. CUDE: You have to have the bathrooms on the outside wall to get the observation and intensive care you need.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't know that I speak for everybody, but I think it would be all right to do a concrete building and get a whole new character -- honest, of our times. We question the pattern and introduction of brick and things like that, and I think myself there could be more study made. There is more than one way of framing an exterior wall, and I think through structure, that's the only thing I can talk about, you might be able to get a more interesting pattern. I don't think there's one solution. I don't think what I've suggested is the solution. All I am saying think there ought to be some study made because I

been great progress made in a slow and funny sort of way on this whole project, and it would be a shame -- when you really get into it at night, you have just a little bunch of holes here that have nothing to do with the frame structure or anythi and I think we are saying the idea of contemporary buildings having nothing to do with the old buildings, but somewhat the sense of scale, but we're not sure of this pattern, structure of solid and voids is the best yet.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think that summarizes our position very well, actually.

FATHER COLLINS: If I may ask a question, this (indicating) is an existing brick building, a dormitory. Thereis glass in here. It's really a relatively orange red brick. This (indicating) is an existing building here. This is orange brick. This is glass here with black glass between the floors and aluminum facing in here (indicating). These would be the only things you could see, really, except little caches of the building. This (indicating) is an existing building of the same color brick as this and this (indicating). These three bricks are harmonious.

Now as I understood it, the question of putting a brick panel in here, plus the fenestration --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think that's right. I don't think we want brick in here. I don't. If you just look at

this drawing, if this were all black and white, some masonry, and this little touch of red here wouldn't bother me at all -- it would be kind of fun. This is so strong and this white and this pattern going through here like that, that if this is red and this little touch of red here wouldn't bother me. What we're saying is there could be a structural system giving you the whole thing and you wouldn't have to have four materials.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We must be clear we are not ruling out any specific material. If they turn the whole thing in brick, we are willing to consider it.

MR. CHANDLER: The principle of the concrete frame -- can we establish that?

MR. WARNECKE: If the client wants no brick on that facade, then --

FATHER COLLINS: How about from the Reservoir Road side, would you think from that side the principle would still be the same; namely, this is a difficult -- I spent about two hours trying to visualize this with Ted. You see we are controlled by brick in here, a read, but next time you drive by the hospital, look and see if it looks red to you. It's a red blue. There's a lot of blue in it. And this (indicating) is an old dark red with really nice appearance as seen from the street. Now, these two (indicating) will still remain and

this one (indicating) will. Do we have to treat the Reservoir Road side the same in terms of materials -- I won't say "have to" but would it be better to treat the same on the Reservoir Road side as you would on the interior campus?

MR. WARNECKE: We thought the concrete expressed there running all around the campus would be very good. It should not be brick.

FATHER COLLINS: Yes, I like that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: First place the concrete could be a tannish tint to the concrete, not white, so you could have a tannish color and you could use instead of dark gray glass, you could use brown tinted glass, which would give warmth, so you get a feeling of a warmth and a red which would g pretty well together, from either side.

FATHER COLLINS: Both sides?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes.

FATHER COLLINS: Because here(indicating) we are going to have parking decks which will have green in front of them.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Tan, green and red would be very nice.

Mr. Mariani's here.

MR. MARIANI: Mr. Bunshaft, if the brick we are indicating there was a compatible tone of brick, not a glaring red brick or pink brick but more in the line of the bronze shade

glass we're thinking about, and the aggregate of the concrete which would be basically River Run gravel, something that would be exposed to give tan composition --

MR. KELLY: You mean a brown brick?

MR. MARIANI: A brown red mixture to get harmony.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You have three materials inside that bay.

MR. WARNECKE: I think if you're going to go to a brown brick, I think --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Then it's lost all point.

MR. WARNECKE: Then you have lost all the point. You must make up your mind you either want to in some degree by color note or texture bring a little brick into it, and do it really well or go all concrete. There are two different distinctive approaches.

MR. BUNSHAFT: One thing you might consider just to start you off, for one thing, just take one building at a time. They don't all have to be identical in detail. This (indicating) consists of a series of single rooms. You can have a structural system that expresses series of single rooms, of a window here where people can look out. They've got a little room and the nice view. And the structure can be 5, 10 or whatever you want and get rid of this solid thing. If you want to go to that, that's kind of dull, I think myself; but you could also go to one like that, of a column here (indicating) or leave it off down here, any pattern

you want but there's one thing to start with, you have a room there and you might recognize that as a starter. Get a pattern of squares. That's one. There are others.

MR. KELLY: We don't think you need, in order to organize the whole south elevation, to have exactly the same bay spacing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All we're saying is you've made wonderful progress, and it seems that somebody ought to do a little more study. The outside wall could almost be wall bearing. It could be a truss if you wanted. It doesn't have to be lined up in nice neat brick.

MR. WARNECKE: It is going to be a very powerful thing for the university.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I think we've probably covered as much as we can. We hope we've been helpful.

MR. KELLY: I think we should emphasize it's a real step forward.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Has any member of the Commission any further business to bring up? If not, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon at 4:00 P.M. the meeting was adjourned.

3 May 1966

Dear Mr. Green:

At its April 19th meeting, the Commission of Fine Arts considered further design studies for the Georgetown University Medical Center. The Commission recommends additional study of the exterior treatment of the proposed structures.

There is no objection to tying together various buildings with a uniform type and scale of expressed structure; in fact, the Commission feels this is essential to the completed design. However, it is suggested that this be restudied without the present brick panel in-fill and with a smaller module. We discussed this in considerable detail with the architects and representatives of the University.

The Commission meets again on May 18th, and will be glad to review any new studies at that time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of
Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT N

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 April 1966

AM
10:15 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting:
Executive Session: 17 May 1966, 10:15 a.m.
Open Session: 18 May 1966, 9:30 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of February 1966 Meeting

3. West Front Extension of Capitol, Engineering Report

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

National Square - Development of Revised Design

2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. National Zoological Park, Addition to Phase 4

b. West Plaza, Municipal Center - Additional Landscaping Elements

3. Department of the Navy

Master Plan for Washington Navy Yard, Preliminary Studies

4. Department of the Army

a. Corps of Engineers

U.S. Soldiers Home, Addition to Domiciliary Building C

b. Special Warfare Memorial Committee

Proposed Memorial at Fort Bragg, N.C.

c. Office of Chief of Support Services

Arlington National Cemetery, Design of Guard Shelters

5. National Park Service, National Capital Region

Ponte Vecchio - Review of Proposed Design and Commission Action

6. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. New York Custom Court and FOB - Selection of Artists

b. Boston FOB - Selection of Artists

7. National Guard Association

National Guard Memorial, Normandy, France - Reconsideration of Design

8. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Union Station - Reroofing of Concourse

(2) S.L. 66-90, 718 15th St., N.W. - Floodlighting of building

(3) Building Applications

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown Medical Center - Further Design Studies

(2) Building Applications

IV. LEGISLATION

1. S. 2394-8/11/65-Mr.Monroney-89thC

To provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States (Review of Commission's action).

2. H.R. 13446-3/9/66-Mr.Bingham-89thC

To provide for the establishment and operation of a National Registry of Art for the purpose of maintaining and administering of records relating to the origin, transfer, and ownership of works of art.

V. INTERVIEWS

3:00 4. 1. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Georgetown Medical Center - Further Design Studies

(Mr. J. P. Green, Assistant Superintendent of Licenses and Permits; representatives of Mariani & Associates, architects)

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 April 1966

~~AM~~ Included in 19 April 1966 meeting - Afternoon Session

~~9:30~~ I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. SUBMISSIONS-INTERVIEWS

~~9:35~~ 1. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Deleted U.S. Soldiers Home, Addition to Domiciliary Building C

~~9:45~~ 2. National Guard Association

3. ✓ National Guard Memorial, Normandy France - Reconsideration of Design

(Major General James F. Cantwell, President, National Guard Association of the United States)

~~10:00~~ 3. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

National Square - Proposed Design

Deleted

(Mr. Nathaniel Owings, architect; representatives of Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

2. ~~10:30~~ 4. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

✓

National Zoological Park, Addition to Phase 4

(Dr. Theodore Reed, Director, National Zoological Park; Mr. Richard Webel, architect)

1. ~~11:00~~ ✓ 5. Department of the Navy

Master Plan for Washington Navy Yard

(Mr. Robert Plavnick, consultant; representatives of Department of the Navy)